

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

FOZYIA HURI,)
)
)
Plaintiff,) Case No. 15 C 5567
)
)
v.)
)
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUDGE OF)
CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY,)
)
)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

On June 23, 2015 Fozyia Huri ("Huri") filed a self-prepared Complaint of Employment Discrimination, employing the form of complaint made available by the Clerk's Office for use by pro se litigants. There is no need to go into such matters as the questionable nature of the target whom she has elected to sue (the Chief Judge of the Circuit Court of Cook County), because the Complaint discloses on its face a fatal flaw that mandates its dismissal at the outset.

Complaint ¶ 8(b) confirms that Huri received EEOC's Notice of Right to Sue (commonly termed a "right-to-sue letter") on March 23, 2015. That right-to-sue letter expressly states -- indeed, emphasizes -- the statutory mandate that suit must be brought within 90 days after its receipt by the suing plaintiff (42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(f)(1)).

In this instance Huri heedlessly and inexplicably (and perhaps failing to recall the familiar part-rhyme and part-recital that begins "Thirty days hath September . . ." and later continues "and all the rest have 31" and that is apparently still universally taught during childhood) filed suit three months to the day after her March 23 date of receipt of EEOC's notification, even though the statutory 90-day time limit ended on June 21 (which, because that was a Sunday, has set a June 22 deadline for bringing suit).

Even one day late is simply too late (see, e.g., this Court's opinion in Wilson v. Doctors Hosp. of Hyde Park, 909 F. Supp. 580, 581 (N.D. 1996) and the cases cited there -- and, indeed, other cases that those cases cite in turn).¹ Accordingly this Court dismisses both Huri's Complaint and this action on the statutory limitations ground.



Milton I. Shadur
Senior United States District Judge

Date: June 25, 2015

¹ Even a little added research has also turned up a substantial number of more recent cases -- some of which cite Wilson itself as relevant precedent -- that apply the same principle.